of transmission parameters," as recited in claim 1 (and the corresponding feature of claim 11). The Office Action asserts that Kino remedies this deficiency in Pompei. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Kino discloses a process corresponding to this feature as shown in Fig. 1 and in the specification at col. 4, lines 41-48, col. 5, lines 50-68 and col. 6, lines 1-37. These assertions are flawed for at least the following reasons.

Kino is directed to a focused imaging system for focusing transmitted acoustic waves into a focal line and for scanning the focal line for waves either reflected or transmitted from an object of interest using piezoelectric transducers. Specifically, Kino teaches applying delay line 18 to transmitter assembly 8 in order to focus acoustic waves in a focal line at a certain distance from a transducer array and sequencing the focal line to generate a rectangular raster compatible with a TV or oscilloscope.

The Office Action asserts that Kino's disclosed process of adjusting the focus of the system to locate the focal line the plane of an object of interest corresponds to the recited "learning." This assertion is incorrect. Kino merely discloses adjusting a focal line based on a predetermined set of equations governing the relationship between focal length and various other parameters. Kino would not have suggested a learning process in which sets of transmission parameters are associated with detected objects and stored for computing a resultant set of transmission parameters.

The Office Action asserts that Kino inherently discloses storing sets of transmission parameters. This assertion is in error. Kino fails to have suggested storing any transmission parameters that could reasonably be considered to correspond to a detected object. Even under broad interpretation, Kino's disclosed imaging process is only configured to achieve a single focal length for an object at a specified distance. Thus, Kino cannot reasonably be considered to teach computing a resultant set of transmission parameters that are based on a stored set of transmission parameters for multiple objects. In reaching its conclusion, the

Office Action applies piecemeal analysis to the features recited in the independent claims and, as a result, fails to take into consideration the logical relationship between each feature disclosed in the independent claims.

Further, the Office Action's assertion of inherency is in error. The standard for an assertion of inherency is that it cannot be based on possibilities or probabilities, but rather the allegedly inherent feature must necessarily flow from the teachings of the reference. This standard is simply not met here. Kino merely discloses an imaging process configured to achieve a single focal length to scan an object at a specified distance based on a predetermined relationship between focal distance and other parameters. Kino provides no indication that any sets of transmission parameters are stored in the manner recited in claims 1 and 11 nor does storing sets of transmission parameters necessarily flow from the teachings of Kino. In addition, the Office Action fails to provide any technical basis supporting this assertion.

Moreover, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have predictably combined the teachings of Pompei with the teachings of Kino. Pompei is directed to an improved audio system having increased bandwidth for generating audio signals with reduced distortion. Pompei is specifically directed to using membrane-type transducers to overcome problems associated with conventional acoustic transducers, *i.e.* piezoelectric transducers (see paragraphs [0003]-[0007]). Pompei teaches that "[o]ne drawback of the ... conventional parametric audio system is that the piezoelectric transducers used therewith typically have a narrow bandwidth." Pompei goes on to disclose that "it is difficult to minimize distortion in the regenerated audio signals" and "because the typical piezoelectric transducer has a diameter of only about 0.25 inches, it is often necessary to include hundreds or thousands of such piezoelectric transducers in the acoustic transducer array to achieve an optimal acoustic transducer surface area, thereby significantly increasing the cost of manufacture." In contrast,

Kino is directed to an electronically focused imaging system specifically adapted for piezoelectric crystals to be used as acoustic transducers (see col. 6, lines 38-53). Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the audio system of Pompei with the piezoelectric transducer configuration of Kino with any reasonable degree of success.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

For at least the above reasons, no combination of the applied references would have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 11. Further, claims 3-6, 8-10 and 13-23, which variously depend from independent claims 1 and 11, also would not have been suggested by the applied references for the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features recited.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-23 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse D. Sukman
Registration No. 54,477

JAO:JDS/lmf

Date: May 4, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**
**P.O. Box 320850**
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461